



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/017,573	12/13/2001	G. William Walster	SUN-P6445-SPL	8135
22835	7590	01/10/2006	EXAMINER	
A. RICHARD PARK, REG. NO. 41241 PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP 2820 FIFTH STREET DAVIS, CA 95616			DATSKOVSKIY, SERGEY	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2121	

DATE MAILED: 01/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/017,573	WALSTER ET AL.
	Examiner Sergey Datskovskiy	Art Unit 2121

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 November 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 22-28 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 22-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the claims

Claims 22-28 were originally presented. After the First Non-final Office Action, claim 22 was amended. Claims 22-28 are still pending in the Instant Application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

1. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically, claim 22 was amended to include a limitation about an interval arithmetic unit *simultaneously* performing arithmetic operations. Such limitation was not present in the specification at the time the application was filed. The description of interval arithmetic unit given in specification in lines 14-27 on page 11 and lines 1-15 on page 12 talks about circuitry that enables the interval operations to be performed efficiently but there is no mention anywhere in the specification that such efficiency is achieved by simultaneously performing multiple arithmetic operations.

2. Claims 23-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as being depended upon a rejected claim 22.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 22-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eldon Hansen's "Global Optimization Using Interval Analysis" (Hansen) in view of Michael J. Schulte et al., "Hardware Interval Multipliers" (Schulte).

Claim 22

Hansen teaches an computer system (page 3, paragraphs 7-9; page 4, paragraphs 1-4) for solving an interval global optimization problem (chapter 12) specified by a function f (page 179, paragraph 1) and a set of equality constraints (page 179, paragraph 1), the computer system comprising:

a processing unit (it is inherent for a computer to contain a processing unit);
a memory (page 3, paragraphs 7-9; it is also inherent for a computer to include memory);

wherein computational code within the memory is configured to perform an interval global optimization process to compute guaranteed bounds on a globally

minimum value of the function $f(x)$ subject to the set of equality constraints (page 186, section 12.8, the steps of the algorithm);

wherein the interval global optimization process is configured to, apply term consistency to the set of equality constraints over a subbox X , and to exclude portions of the subbox X that can be shown to violate any of the equality constraints (page 186, section 12.8, the steps of the algorithm).

Hansen does not expressly disclose an interval arithmetic unit within the processing unit, wherein the interval arithmetic unit is configured to receive floating-point numbers representing a first endpoint and a second endpoint for a first interval and floating-point numbers representing a first endpoint and a second endpoint for a second interval, and is configured to perform arithmetic operations to produce a first endpoint and a second endpoint representing a resulting interval;

However, Schulte teaches an interval arithmetic unit within the processing unit (page 1, Abstract), wherein the interval arithmetic unit is configured to receive floating-point numbers representing a first endpoint and a second endpoint for a first interval and floating-point numbers representing a first endpoint and a second endpoint for a second interval (page 10, Figure 4, first interval is represented by x_l and x_u , second interval is y_l and y_u ; see an example on page 11, last paragraph through page 12 first paragraph), and is configured to simultaneously perform arithmetic operations (page 9, last complete paragraph discloses a parallel computation of interval multiplication) to

produce a first endpoint and a second endpoint representing a resulting interval (Figure 4, z_l and z_u ; page 9, last line continued on page 11, first paragraph);

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the computer system for solving an interval global optimization problem from Hansen and combine it with the interval arithmetic unit from Schulte for the benefit of increasing speed of numeric computations (Hansen, page 4, lines 7-11; Schulte, page 1, Abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify Hansen in view of Schulte by using an interval arithmetic unit in the computer system for solving an interval global optimization problem.

Claim 23

Hansen teaches the computer-system of claim 22.

However, Hansen does not expressly teach that the interval arithmetic unit includes a first input, wherein the first input includes a first floating point number representing a lower bound of the first input and a second floating point number representing an upper bound of the first input; and wherein the interval arithmetic unit includes a second input, wherein the second input includes a third floating point number representing a lower bound of the second input and a fourth floating point number representing an upper bound of the second input.

Schulte teaches that the interval arithmetic unit (page 1, Abstract) includes a first input, wherein the first input includes a first floating point number representing a lower bound of the first input and a second floating point number representing an upper bound

of the first input (page 10, Figure 4, x_l and x_u , second interval is y_l and y_u ; see an example on page 11, last paragraph through page 12 first paragraph); and wherein the interval arithmetic unit includes a second input, wherein the second input includes a third floating point number representing a lower bound of the second input and a fourth floating point number representing an upper bound of the second input (Figure 4, y_l and y_u ; see an example on page 11, last paragraph through page 12 first paragraph).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the computer system for solving an interval global optimization problem from Hansen and combine it with the interval arithmetic unit from Schulte using the same motivation as in claim 22 above.

Claim 24

Hansen teaches the computer-system of claim 22, wherein the optimizer is configured to: precondition the set of equality constraints through multiplication by an approximate inverse matrix B to produce a set of preconditioned equality constraints; apply term consistency to the set of preconditioned equality constraints over the subbox X; and to exclude portions of the subbox X that can be shown to violate any of the preconditioned equality constraints (page 186, section 12.8, the steps of the algorithm. Also see an example in chapter 12.6, pages 184-185).

Claim 25

Hansen teaches the computer-system of claim 22, wherein the optimizer is configured to: keep track of a least upper bound $f_{\bar{b}}$ of the function $f(x)$; unconditionally remove from consideration any subbox for which $\inf(f(x)) > f_{\bar{b}}$; apply term consistency to the inequality $f(x) \leq f_{\bar{b}}$ over the subbox X ; and to exclude portions of the subbox X that violate the inequality (page 186, section 12.8, the steps of the algorithm, in particular, step 2).

Claim 26

Hansen teaches the computer-system of claim 22, wherein the optimizer is configured to: apply box consistency to the set of equality constraints $q_i(x) = 0$ ($i=1, \dots, r$) over the subbox X ; and to exclude portions of the subbox X that violate the set of equality constraints (page 186, section 12.8, the steps of the algorithm).

Claim 27

Hansen teaches the computer-system of claim 22, wherein the optimizer is configured to: evaluate a first termination condition; wherein the first termination condition is TRUE if a function of the width of the subbox X is less than a pre-specified value, ϵ_X , and the absolute value of the function, f , over the subbox X is less than a pre-specified value, ϵ_F ; and to terminate further splitting of the subbox X if the first termination condition is TRUE (page 186, section 12.8, the steps of the algorithm, in particular, steps 16-18. Also see page 99, chapter 87 describing box reduction: "When

it is sufficiently reduced, we do not split it. Instead, we try to reduce it further by reapplying the algorithm to it").

Claim 28

Hansen teaches the computer-system of claim 22, wherein the optimizer is configured to perform an interval Newton step on the John conditions (page 186, section 12.8, the steps of the algorithm, and specifically, step 14).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 22-28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sergey Datskovskiy whose telephone number is (571) 272-8188. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Knight, can be reached on (571) 272-3687. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

S.D.

Assistant examiner

A.U. 2121



Anthony Knight

Supervisory Patent Examiner

Technology Center 2100